

Minutes – Senate Budget Policies Committee Meeting
March 25, 2016
2:00 pm in 156 Cathedral of Learning

Members in attendance: Elia Beniash, Tyler Bickford, Mackey Friedman, Beverly Ann Gaddy (chair), Wesley Rohrer, David Rowe, Jessica Sevcik (CGS), Adriana Maguiña-Ugarte (SAC), John Baker, David DeJong, Amanda Brodish, Stephen Wisniewski, Richard Henderson, Frank Wilson (Senate Pres.), Kimberly Barlow (UTimes)

Absent: Hiro Good, Emily Murphy, Cindy Tananis, Nick Reslink (SGB), Timothy Folts (GPSG), Stephen L. Carr, Sean Hughes, Richard Pratt, Phil Wion, Arthur Ramicone.

Meeting called at 2:02 pm by Chair Gaddy

1. Approval of the minutes of Friday, February 19, 2016 meeting *Draft minutes was sent to the SPBC members prior to the meeting. It was approved without edits.*
2. Matters arising, announcements, proposals for new business
 - A. Elia Beniash asked whether the budget had passed. D. DeJong confirmed that Pitt had approved it a while ago, and that currently PA Gov. Wolf is letting the State budget approved by the PA legislature to go into effect over the weekend without his signature. There is a small chance that it may not pass through.
 - B. Frank Wilson added that if it passed without a change, Pitt will receive 5% more than what was asked.
 - C. Wesley Rohrer asked if Pitt had had to tap into the [cash] reserves. DeJong answered yes, it had. Rohrer asked whether the appropriations transfers will fill the reserves back. DeJong added that Pitt is expecting to continue to use the reserves for the rest of the FY. State appropriations are notorious for not transferring in lump-sum. Furthermore, the State has a deficit which is hard to fill; so our (Pitt) budget could be rescinded, cut-back, etc.
 - D. Wilson added that the mood Pitt felt in Harrisburg (on Pitt in Harrisburg Day) was that financials are not going to get better.
3. Results on university-wide PBS survey (D. DeJong and A. Brodish).
 - A. DeJong acknowledged the large amount of work on the survey preparation and results tallying that Amanda Brodish put in. Committee at large agreed and thanked her. An Overview of the results was shared with every member of the BPC.
 - B. DeJong reported that there was huge participation as seen on Table 1; particularly from a group who has never participated in a PBC at any level (based on responses).
 - C. Chair Gaddy read Cindy Tananis (who could not attend this meeting) comments/suggestions: “to support the notion that we need to communicate more; maybe like the *safety brochure* that we get at the beginning of the year”.
 - D. Rohrer asked DeJong what had “surprised” him. DeJong answered “the numbers that responded and numbers that didn’t know about PBC processes but responded nonetheless.” He agrees with Tananis about more communication.
 - E. John Baker commented that he strongly agrees that the university is better off because the UPBC but was very disappointed in faculty participation levels; and the overall numbers of participation. He also would have liked to see the results separated between staff and

- administrators (not aggregated as in the overview of the results).
- F. Brodish remarked that Pitt has about 13,000 employees of which 10% responded. This response level is usually seen as “pretty darn good” as far as survey response levels go. That said, she agreed that faculty were underrepresented, particularly those in the health sciences.
 - G. Baker expressed to be very concerned about shared governance where faculty (particularly in the health sciences) declare low levels of knowledge
 - H. Beniash criticized that faculty does not actually make it a point of theirs to learn the process.
 - I. Wilson added a comment based on anecdotal examples where faculty are not aware of the PBS process. When he goes back to campus (Greensburg) he will now address his colleagues with the idea that he needs to more clear, transparent, and communicative. We are at the stage where we can inform everyone and let them all be more involved.
 - J. Rohrer is concerned that faculty do not know their power to influence and provide input in the PBS process.
 - K. Beniash also pointed out that in his area he has no knowledge of the Senior Vice Chancellor level PBC; and that faculty do get passionate about budget issues.
 - L. DeJong agreed to review the results to add the percentage response and disaggregating staff from administrators. These changes will be in the final report.
 - M. Mackey Friedman asked whether the BPC can get access to the raw data. DeJong indicating this was possible after deleting a couple of answers that broke the anonymity rule. He also added that he will make himself available to talk with folks that have concerns in their areas regarding the PBS where there may be issues of data sharing and transparency.
 - N. Gaddy said BPC will wait for the final report, so that it can then be disseminated.
 - O. DeJong clarified that the report needs to go to the Council of Deans first, then the report can be shared with the BPC.

Note: a related article (<http://www.utimes.pitt.edu/?p=39041>) was printed on the April 14, 2016 issue (volume 48, issue 16) of the University Times.

- 4. Review of revised PBS document (B. Gaddy, W. Rohrer, F. Wilson, D. DeJong).
 - A. DeJong started by thanking the committee members that worked on the revision of the document. There were three categories of changes: (1) to generalize tone, (2) to reflect better current practices, and (3) to eliminate redundancies. It is now easier to follow by all; it is a more robust document. Now it just needs to be followed.
 - B. Baker presented an objection to a proposed change in Section 3.3.2 Historical data. The revised document now says that “The most recent Revenue and Cost Attribution Study may also be distributed”. The document should not be changed and remain as originally written which is “...will also be distributed”. Otherwise, production and distribution of the “attribution report” becomes optional and can be eliminated unilaterally by the administration without any recourse for objection, because the PBS document would no longer mandate annual distribution of the most recent study. This point is critical given that the administration previously unilaterally suspended production of the Attribution study 7 years ago, and it was a long struggle getting its production resumed again (starting two years ago).
 - C. Gaddy read editorial suggestions sent via email by Phil Wion who could not attend this meeting. There were several mostly to clarify the use of English language. But first edit

related to not specifying “the Senate Committees” participation in the overview of the process as it is too specific. As the Senate sometimes creates ad-hoc committees, the overview of the process should be by any Standing and Ad-hoc committee. His suggestions would be reviewed and incorporated.

- D. Wilson, in concluding and summarizing, said that if the BPC approves this draft then it will be in an agenda item at Faculty Assembly on April 12. Even if more changes were to be suggested, there is another Faculty Assembly (where document needs to be approved) scheduled for later in the year.
- E. BPC at large approved unanimously to accept the new PBS document with the changes submitted today.

Adjourned by 3:20 pm.